

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/718,071	11/21/2000	Jay C. Hsu	KCX-359 (15169)	1979	
7590 07/14/2005			EXAMINER		
Jason W. Johnston,			YU, GINA C		
Dority & Manni	ng, P.A.				
PO Box 1449			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Greenville, SC 29602-1449			1617		

DATE MAILED: 07/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/718,071	HSU ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Gina C. Yu	1617	

	Gina C. Yu	1617				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED <u>June 15, 2005</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.				
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follo places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compl following time periods: 	wing replies: (1) an amendment, a ptice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in	ffidavit, or other evide compliance with 37 (ence, which CFR 41.31; or			
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of	the final rejection.					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adviewent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	sory Action, or (2) the date set forth in than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FI	f the final rejection.				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL						
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compof filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any expine a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be AMENDMENTS	xtension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal o	of the appeal.			
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brie	f. will not be entered	because			
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co						
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	w);	•				
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	ter form for appeal by materially re	educing or simplifying	the issues for			
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	· -	ejected claims.				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1	21. See attached Notice of Non-C	ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a	•	timely filed amendm	nent canceling			
the non-allowable claim(s).		•	-			
 For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro 	☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ w vided below or appended.	vill be entered and an	explanation of			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: <u>none</u> .						
Claim(s) objected to: <u>none</u> .						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-4,7-17,19-22,24-27,29,44 and 45</u> .		•				
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>none</u> .						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an 						
and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			201 4 4			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a			
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after	entry is below or attac	ched.			
 The request for reconsideration has been considered bu see continuation sheet. 	it does NOT place the application i	in condition for allowa	ince because:			
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper	NO(8)				
13. Other:	,,,,,,,	W/7)	.0			
	,	Madman	odkon			
	SRE	ENI PADMANABHA	N			

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Art Unit: 1617

Continuation from No. 11:

Applicant's arguments filed on June 15, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Page 2

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). While applicants assert the deficiencies of each cited references, applicants are reminded that the rejection should be construed in view of the collective teachings of the references. What is not addressed in the argument is whether the combination of the references would have been nonobvious in view of the specific motivation cited by examiner in the final rejection, i.e., whether adding talloweth-60 myristyl glycol to the Hammonds skin cleansing composition as a thickener, in view of the teachings of the references, would have been nonobvious.

Applicants assert that combination of the whole compositions of each reference would not have been obvious. For example, applicants argue the unfeasibility of combining the wet wipes of Hammonds with the solid composition of Sebillotte-Arnaud or Pontini's gel. The issue in this case is not whether a skilled artisan would have combined the whole compositions of each cited reference per se. The rejection is based on the ground that incorporating the specific ingredient that is claimed in applicants' invention would have been obvious in view of the teachings of the

Art Unit: 1617

references, which provides the teachings on the specific function and benefits of said ingredient.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gina C. Yu whose telephone number is 571-272-8605. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, from 8:30 AM until 6:00 PM..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreeni Padmanabhan can be reached on 571-272-0629. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Gina Yu Patent Examiner